

Appendix A: General Methodological Principles of Study Design

When making national coverage determinations, CMS evaluates relevant clinical evidence to determine whether or not the evidence is of sufficient quality to support a finding that an item or service falling within a benefit category is reasonable and necessary for the diagnosis or treatment of illness or injury or to improve the functioning of a malformed body member. The critical appraisal of the evidence enables us to determine whether: 1) the specific assessment questions can be answered conclusively; and 2) the intervention will improve net health outcomes for patients. An improved net health outcome is one of several considerations in determining whether an item or service is reasonable and necessary.

CMS divides the assessment of clinical evidence into three stages: 1) the quality of the individual studies; 2) the relevance of findings from individual studies to the Medicare population; and 3) overarching conclusions that can be drawn from the body of the evidence on the direction and magnitude of the intervention's risks and benefits.

The issues presented here represent a broad discussion of the issues we consider when reviewing clinical evidence. However, it should be noted that each coverage determination has unique methodological aspects.

1. Assessing Individual Studies

Methodologists have developed criteria to determine weaknesses and strengths of clinical research. Strength of evidence generally refers to: 1) the scientific validity underlying study findings regarding causal relationships between health care interventions and health outcomes; and 2) the reduction of bias. In general, some of the methodological attributes associated with stronger evidence include those listed below:

- Use of randomization (allocation of patients to either intervention or control group) in order to minimize bias.
- Use of contemporaneous control groups (rather than historical controls) in order to ensure comparability between the intervention and control groups.
- Prospective (rather than retrospective) studies to ensure a more thorough and systematic assessment of factors related to outcomes.
- Larger sample sizes in studies to help ensure adequate numbers of patients are enrolled to demonstrate both statistically significant as well as clinically significant outcomes that can be extrapolated to the Medicare population. Sample size should be large enough to make chance an unlikely explanation for what was found.
- Masking (blinding) to ensure patients and investigators do not know to which group patients were assigned (intervention or control). This is important especially in subjective outcomes, such as pain or quality of life, where enthusiasm and psychological factors may lead to an improved perceived outcome by either the patient or assessor.

Regardless of whether the design of a study is a randomized controlled trial, a non-randomized controlled trial, a cohort study or a case-control study, the primary criterion for methodological

strength or quality is the extent to which differences between intervention and control groups can be attributed to the intervention studied. This is known as internal validity. Various types of bias can undermine internal validity. These include:

- Different characteristics between patients participating and those theoretically eligible for study but not participating (selection bias)
- Co-interventions or provision of care apart from the intervention under evaluation (confounding)
- Differential assessment of outcome (detection bias)
- Occurrence and reporting of patients who do not complete the study (attrition bias)

In principle, rankings of research design have been based on the ability of each study design category to minimize these biases. A randomized controlled trial minimizes systematic bias (in theory) by selecting a sample of participants from a particular population and allocating them randomly to the intervention and control groups. Thus, randomized controlled studies have been typically assigned the greatest strength, followed by non-randomized clinical trials and controlled observational studies. The following is a representative list of study designs (some of which have alternative names) ranked from most to least methodologically rigorous in their potential ability to minimize systematic bias:

- Randomized controlled trials
- Non-randomized controlled trials
- Prospective cohort studies
- Retrospective case control studies
- Cross-sectional studies
- Surveillance studies (e.g., using registries or surveys)
- Consecutive case series
- Single case reports

When there are merely associations but not causal relationships between a study's variables and outcomes, it is important not to draw causal inferences. Confounding refers to independent variables that systematically vary with the causal variable. This distorts measurement of the outcome of interest because its effect size is mixed with the effects of other extraneous factors. For observational, and in some cases randomized controlled trials, the method in which confounding factors are handled (either through stratification or appropriate statistical modeling) are of particular concern. For example, in order to interpret and generalize conclusions to our population of Medicare patients, it may be necessary for studies to match or stratify their intervention and control groups by patient age or co-morbidities.

Methodological strength is, therefore, a multidimensional concept that relates to the design, implementation and analysis of a clinical study. In addition, thorough documentation of the conduct of the research, particularly study's selection criteria, rate of attrition and process for data collection, is essential for CMS to adequately assess the evidence.

2. Generalizability of Clinical Evidence to the Medicare Population

The applicability of the results of a study to other populations, settings, treatment regimens, and outcomes assessed is known as external validity. Even well-designed and well-conducted trials may not supply the evidence needed if the results of a study are not applicable to the Medicare population. Evidence that provides accurate information about a population or setting not well represented in the Medicare program would be considered but would suffer from limited generalizability.

The extent to which the results of a trial are applicable to other circumstances is often a matter of judgment that depends on specific study characteristics, primarily the patient population studied (age, sex, severity of disease, and presence of co-morbidities) and the care setting (primary to tertiary level of care, as well as the experience and specialization of the care provider). Additional relevant variables are treatment regimens (dosage, timing, and route of administration), co-interventions or concomitant therapies, and type of outcome and length of follow-up.

The level of care and the experience of the providers in the study are other crucial elements in assessing a study's external validity. Trial participants in an academic medical center may receive more or different attention than is typically available in non-tertiary settings. For example, an investigator's lengthy and detailed explanations of the potential benefits of the intervention and/or the use of new equipment provided to the academic center by the study sponsor may raise doubts about the applicability of study findings to community practice.

Given the evidence available in the research literature, some degree of generalization about an intervention's potential benefits and harms is invariably required in making coverage decisions for the Medicare population. Conditions that assist us in making reasonable generalizations are biologic plausibility, similarities between the populations studied and Medicare patients (age, sex, ethnicity and clinical presentation), and similarities of the intervention studied to those that would be routinely available in community practice.

A study's selected outcomes are an important consideration in generalizing available clinical evidence to Medicare coverage determinations because one of the goals of our determination process is to assess net health outcomes. We are interested in the results of changed patient management not just altered management. These outcomes include resultant risks and benefits such as increased or decreased morbidity and mortality. In order to make this determination, it is often necessary to evaluate whether the strength of the evidence is adequate to draw conclusions about the direction and magnitude of each individual outcome relevant to the intervention under study. In addition, it is important that an intervention's benefits are clinically significant and durable, rather than marginal or short-lived.

If key health outcomes have not been studied or the direction of clinical effect is inconclusive, we may also evaluate the strength and adequacy of indirect evidence linking intermediate or surrogate outcomes to our outcomes of interest.

3. Assessing the Relative Magnitude of Risks and Benefits

Generally, an intervention is not reasonable and necessary if its risks outweigh its benefits. Net health outcomes are one of several considerations in determining whether an item or service is reasonable and necessary. For most determinations, CMS evaluates whether reported benefits translate into improved net health outcomes. CMS places greater emphasis on health outcomes actually experienced by patients, such as quality of life, functional status, duration of disability, morbidity and mortality, and less emphasis on outcomes that patients do not directly experience, such as intermediate outcomes, surrogate outcomes, and laboratory or radiographic responses. The direction, magnitude, and consistency of the risks and benefits across studies are also important considerations. Based on the analysis of the strength of the evidence, CMS assesses the relative magnitude of an intervention or technology's benefits and risk of harm to Medicare beneficiaries.

Appendix B
CMS Review Table for Lumbar Artificial Disc Replacement

Author/ Year	Study Design	Demographics	Intervention, outcome measures; instruments	Results		Methodological Comments
				Intervention group	Control group	
	Study, inclusion/exclusion	N, age, sex,				
Blumenthal/2005	Randomized controlled trial – Charite III vs BAK cage fusion, anterior approach. Multiple inclusion/exclusion, discography included.	304 pts 14 centers Randomized 2:1 Mean age = 40 (range 19 – 60) M 157, F=147	24 mos f/u. Composite endpoint of 4 criteria. Others outcomes	Clinical success in 57% of Charite group. Noninferior, p = 0.0001	Clinical success in 46% of control.	
Caspi/2003	Case series Low back pain with/without radicular pain, under age 55.	20 24-50 years 11 men 9 women	f/u 48 months. return to work clinical results rated as fair, good, excellent, poor	Fair = 3, good = 4, excellent = 11, poor = 4. 4 completely disabled, 1 resumed physical labor, others returned to light and sedentary work.	None	
Cinotti/1996	Case series Contraindications included facet degeneration by CT or MRI and disc degeneration adjacent to a fused area and spondylolisthesis. Single surgeon series.	46 Average age 36 (27 – 44 years) 21 M, 25 W	f/u 2 yr min. Clinical results physician rated and patient satisfaction.	Excellent 24% Good 39% Fair 30% Poor 7% 8 of 17 who had unsatisfactory results underwent fusion.	None	

Author/ Year	Study Design	Demographics	Intervention, outcome measures; instruments	Results		Methodological Comments
				Intervention group	Control group	
	Study, inclusion/exclusion	N, age, sex,				
David/2002	Case series Chronic low back pain alone or with sciatica. 72 with previous surgery. MRI, discography.	147 Unknown ages, sex	f/u 5 years minimum. Stauffer Coventry classification	79% excellent or good	None	Abstract only available.
Geisler/2004	Same as Blumenthal/2005	Same as Blumenthal/2005	24 mos f/u Neurologic adverse events	Neurologic adverse events: Investigational group 16.6%	Control group 17.2%	Same study group as Blumenthal/2005
Griffith/1994	Case series Diagnosis DDD 65.2%, postnucleotomy syndrome 15%, internal disc derangement 10.9%, others. 31% - 1 prior procedure, 10% - 2 or more prior procedures.	93 139 prosthesis Models I,II,III Age range 25-59 43 male 50 female	f/u range for III 1 to 37 mos. Work status, pain reduction, neurologic weakness, straight leg raising, ability to walk.	Significant proportion experienced pain relief $p < 0.05$. Improvements in pain intensity, walking distance, decreased SLR, weakness, no difference in work status.	None	
Lemaire/1997	Case series Average pre-op pain 6 years.	105 Average age 39.2 years. Range 24-50 years. 68 M, 37 F	f/u average 51 months. Modified Stauffer-Coventry rating scale, work status, radiographic results.	79% good results.	None	

Author/ Year	Study Design	Demographics	Intervention, outcome measures; instruments	Results		Methodological Comments
				Intervention group	Control group	
	Study, inclusion/exclusion	N, age, sex,				
Lemaire/2005	Case series Excluded if obese, prior fusion, suffered from radicular pain, or spondylolisthesis or facet arthrosis	100 Average age at surgery 40, Range 24-51 41 M, 59 F	f/u minimum 10 years. Modified Stauffer-Coventry rating scale, work status, radiographic results.	62% excellent 28% good 10% poor	None	
McAfee/2005	Same as Blumenthal/2005	Same as Blumenthal/2005	24 mos f/u. Radiographs	Lateral flexion/extension films: 13.6% increase from baseline in investigational group. Disc: 82.9% ideal placement.	decreased in control group	Same study group as Blumenthal/2005
Putzier/2005	Case series Indication moderate to severe DDD	53 pts 63 prosthesis Charite I,II and III Avg. age 44, (30 – 59 range). 22 M, 33 F	Average f/u 17 yrs. VAS, ODI, subjective perception of overall outcome, radiographic measurements.	60% spontaneous ankylosis. Re-operation in 11% of patients.	none	
Sott/2000	Case series Discography performed, MRI, radiographs, Bone density, pre-op long standing disabling lumbar pain.	14 31-61 years 8 male 6 female	Mean f/u 48 mos. Good: >75% pain relief, return to work, <= slight physical restriction, no analgesics.	Good: 10/14 Fair: 2/14 Poor: 2/14	None	
Van Ooij/2003	Case report From a series of 500 pts operated on in a single institution.	27 pts Mean age 40 (30 – 67) M 12, F 15	Mean f/u 53 months.	complications	none	

Author/ Year	Study Design	Demographics	Intervention, outcome measures; instruments	Results		Methodological Comments
				Intervention group	Control group	
	Study, inclusion/exclusion	N, age, sex,				
Zeegers/1999	Case series Failed conservative tx. 54% had previous surgery, radiographs, CT, discography, MRI. 29 pts one level, 18 at two levels, 3 had 3 levels.	56 Mean age 43 (24-59 years) 30 F, 20 M	2 year outcomes. Improved pain, Return to work.	Stauffer and Coventry criteria: 70% had good or fair, 65% improved low back pain, 81% return to some work, 83% “no regret.”	None	

APPENDIX C

References from public comments on proposed DM

Albert TJ, Pinto M, Denis F. Management of symptomatic lumbar pseudarthrosis with anteroposterior fusion. A functional and radiographic outcome study. *Spine* 2000 Jan;25(1):123-9; discussion 130.

Anderson PS, Sasso RC, Metcalf N. Reoperation Rates for Cervical Arthroplasty versus Arthrodesis. Presented at the Annual Meeting of the Cervical Spine Research Society, December 1, 2005, San Diego, California. Paper # 2.

Anderson, P.A., Rouleau, J.P. Intervertebral disc arthroplasty. *Spine* 2004;29 (23):2779-86.

Baldwin, N.G. Lumbar disc disease: the natural history. *Neurosurg Focus* 2002;13(2):1-4.

Bertagnoli R, Yue J, Nanieva R, et al. Lumbar total disc arthroplasty in patients older than 60 years of age: a prospective study of the ProDisc prosthesis with 2-year minimum follow-up period. *J Neurosurg Spine*, 2006 Feb; 4(2):85-90.

Bertagnoli R, Yue J, Fenk-Mayer, et al. Treatment of symptomatic adjacent-segment degeneration after lumbar fusion with total disc arthroplasty by using the ProDisc prosthesis: a prospective study with 2- year minimum follow up. *J Neurosurg Spine* 2006 Feb;4:91-97.

Bertagnoli R, Yue, J, Fenk-Mayer A, et al. The treatment of disabling single-level lumbar discogenic low back pain with total disc arthroplasty utilizing the ProDisc prosthesis: a prospective study with 2 -year minimum follow-up. *Spine*. 2005 Oct 1; 30(19):2230-6.

Blumenthal SL, McAfee PC, Geisler FH, et al. Response to the Editorial and Points of View Regarding the IDE Study of the CHARITÉ Artificial Disc. *Spine* 2005;30:Linked via *Article Plus* to Zindrick et al E388-90.

(<http://acs.ovid.com/acs/.07c63f3cd0d097a5852d586d86b21382eede1495b0a100991458bf79dcde076fc47b410a1ab865f70f9415b4374bc8820372cdb3445e11fc3531684d5a3c204c05.pdf>) (last accessed 04/06/2006).

Blumenthal SL, McAfee PC, Guyer RD, et al. A Prospective, Randomized, Multicenter Food and Drug Administration Investigational Device Exemptions Study of Lumbar Total Disc Replacement with the CHARITÉ™ Artificial Disc Versus Lumbar Fusion Part I: Evaluation of Clinical Outcomes. *Spine* 2005;30:1565-75.

Buttermann GR, Glazer PA, Hu SS, Bradford DS. Revision of failed lumbar fusions. A comparison of anterior autograft and allograft. *Spine* 1997 Dec 1;22(23):2748-55.

Büttner-Janzen, Karin, Letter to the Editor concerning "Charité total disc replacement: clinical and radiographical results after an average follow-up of 17 years" (M. Putzier et al.). Will be published in the April 2006 issue of *Eur Spine J*.

Chen WJ, Lai PL, Chen LH. Adjacent instability after instrumented lumbar fusion. *Chang Gung Med J*. 2003 Nov;26(11):792-8. Taipei.

Chen WJ, Lai PL, Niu CC, et al. Surgical Treatment of Adjacent Instability After Lumbar Spine Fusion. *Spine* 2001;26(22):E519-E524.

Christensen FB, Thomsen K, Eiskjaer SP, Gelinick J, Bunger CE. Functional outcome after posterolateral spinal fusion using pedicle screws: comparison between primary and salvage procedure. *Eur Spine J*. 1998;7(4):321-7.

Cinotti G, David T, Postacchini F. Results of disc prosthesis after a minimum follow up of 2 years. *Spine* 1996;21:995-1000.

David T. Revision of a Charite artificial disc 9.5 years in vivo to a new Charite artificial disc: case report and explant analysis. *Eur Spine J*. 2005 Jun;14(5):507-11. Epub 2005 Jan 26.

David T. Lumbar disc prosthesis: five year follow-up study on 96 patients. Presented at the 15th Annual Meeting of the North American Spine Society (NASS) 2000. New Orleans, Louisiana.

David, T. "Lumbar Disc Prosthesis: An Analysis of Long-Term Complications for 272 CHARITÉ Artificial Disc Prostheses with Minimum 10 Year Follow-up." *Spine J* 2004;4: S50-1.

de Kleuver, M., F. C. Oner, et al. "Total disc replacement for chronic low back pain: background and a systematic review of the literature." *Eur Spine J* 2003;12(2): 108-16.

Delamarter RB, Bae HW, Pradhan BB. Clinical results of ProDisc-II lumbar total disc replacement: report from the United States Clinical Trial. *Orthop Clin N Am* 2005;36:301-313.

Delamarter RD, Zigler J, Ohnmeiss D. Lumbar Total Disc Replacement: a 2 to 3 year report from 2 centers in the US Clinical trial for Prodisc-II prosthesis. *The Spine Journal* 5: 157 S- 158 S, 2005.

Denozière, G., Ku, D.N. Biomechanical comparison between fusion of two vertebrae and implantation of an artificial intervertebral disc. *J Biomechanics* 2006;39: 766-75.

Deyo RA, Gray DT, Kreuter W, et al. United States Trends in Lumbar Fusion Surgery for Degenerative Conditions. *Spine* 2005;30(12):1441-1445.

Deyo RA, Mirza SK. Trends and Variations in the Use of Spine Surgery. *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research* 2006;443:139-146.

Diwan AD, Parvartaneni H, Cammisa F. Failed degenerative lumbar spine surgery. *Orthop Clin N Am* 2003;34:309-324.

Etminan M, Girardi FP, Khan SN, Cammisa FP Jr. Revision strategies for lumbar pseudarthrosis. *Orthop Clin North Am.* 2002 Apr;33(2):381-92.

FDA "CHARITÉ Artificial Disc summary of safety and effectiveness. PMA number P040006. October 26, 2004."

FDA "Summary of Safety and Effectiveness Data" Infuse bone graft/LT Cage Lumbar Tapered Fusion Device, Premarket Approval Application (PMA) number, P000058, Approved July 2, 2002. www.fda.gov/cdrh/pdf/p000058b.doc

Gamradt S C, Wang JC. "Lumbar disc arthroplasty." *Spine J* 2005;5(1): 95-103.

Geisler FH, Blumenthal SL, et al. "Neurological complications of lumbar artificial disc replacement and comparison of clinical results with those related to lumbar arthrodesis in the literature: results of a multicenter, prospective, randomized investigational device exemption study of Charite intervertebral disc. Invited submission from the Joint Section Meeting on Disorders of the Spine and Peripheral Nerves, March 2004." *J Neurosurg Spine* 2004;1(2): 143-54.

Geisler, FH, Blumenthal, SL; Guyer, RD: Alternative Statistical Testing Demonstrates Superiority of Lumbar Arthroplasty at 2 Years vs Fusion for the Treatment of One-Level Lumbar Degenerative Disc Disease at L4-5 or L5-S1. Accepted for podium presentation at the Annual Meeting of the Spine Arthroplasty Society, Montreal, Canada, May 9-13, 2006; the 13th Annual International Meeting on Advanced Spine Techniques (IMAST), Athens, Greece, July 11-15, 2006; and Spine Across The Sea, July 23-27, Maui, Hawaii (Exhibit B of DePuy comment references data). Geisler FH, Blumenthal SL, Guyer RD. Alternative Statistical Testing Demonstrates Superiority of Lumbar Arthroplasty at 2 Years vs. Fusion for the Treatment of One-Level Lumbar Degenerative Disc Disease at L4-5 or L5-S1. *Spine* 2006; 31: (in Press)

Griffith, S. L., A. P. Shelokov, et al. "A multicenter retrospective study of the clinical results of the LINK SB Charite intervertebral prosthesis. The initial European experience." *Spine* 1994;19(16):1842-9.

Guyer RD, McAfee PC, Hochschuler SH, et al. Prospective randomized study of the Charité artificial disc: data from two investigational centers. *Spine Journal* 2004;4 :252S-259S.

Guyer RD, Ohnmeiss DD. Intervertebral disc prostheses. *Spine* 2003;28:S15- S23.

Hacker RJ, Cauthen JC, Gilbert TJ, et al. A prospective randomized multicenter clinical evaluation of an anterior cervical fusion cage. *Spine* 2000;25(20):2646-55.

Hägg O, Fritzell P, Nordwall A: The clinical importance of changes in outcome scores after treatment for chronic low back pain. *Eur Spine J*, 2003 12:12–20.

Hagg O, Fritzell P, et al. "Predictors of outcome in fusion surgery for chronic low back pain. A report from the Swedish Lumbar Spine Study." *Eur Spine J* 2003;12(1): 22-33.

Health Technology Assessment Information Service. Target database. (March 2004). Artificial intervertebral disc replacement for degenerative disc disease. ECRI HTAIS.

Kuslich S D, Ulstrom C L, et al. "The Bagby and Kuslich method of lumbar interbody fusion. History, techniques, and 2-year follow-up results of a United States prospective, multicenter trial." *Spine* 1998;23(11): 1267-78; discussion 1279.

Le Huec JC, Mathews H, Basso Y, et al. Clinical results of Maverick lumbar total disc replacement: two year prospective follow-up. *Orthop Clin N Am* 2005;36:315-322.

Lemaire JP, Carrier H, Sari Ali E, et al. "Clinical and Radiological Outcomes with the CHARITÉ Artificial Disc: A 10-Year Minimum Follow-Up". *J Spinal Disord* 2005;18:353-59.

Lemaire J P, Skalli W, et al. "Intervertebral disc prosthesis. Results and prospects for the year 2000." *Clin Orthop* 1997;(337): 64-76.

McAfee P, Cunningham B, Holsapple G. et al. A Prospective, Randomized Multicenter Food and Drug Administration Investigational Device Exemption Study of Lumbar Total Disc Replacement with the Charite Artificial Disc versus Lumbar Fusion. Part II: Evaluation of Radiographic Outcomes and Correlation of Surgical Technique Accuracy with Clinical Outcomes. *Spine* 2005;30:1576-1583.

McAfee PC, Fedder IL, Saiedy S, et al. Experimental Design of Total Disk Replacement – Experience with a Prospective Randomized Study of the SB Charite. *Spine* 2003;28:(20):S153-S162.

McAfee PC, Geisler FH, Blumenthal SB, et al. Predicted 5-year Survivorship of the CHARITÉ Artificial Disc vs. Anterior Lumbar Interbody Fusion: A Kaplan-Meier Analysis, IMAST and Scoliosis Research Society Meeting 2006.

McAfee PC, Geisler FH, Saiedy SS. Revisability of the CHARITE™ Artificial Disc Replacement—Analysis of 688 Patients Enrolled in the US IDE Study of the CHARITÉ™ Artificial Disc , *Spine* 2006: 31 (in Press).

McAfee PC, Geisler FH, Scott-Young M. eds. Roundtables in Spine Surgery: Complications and Revision Strategies in Lumbar Spine Arthroplasty, Pub. St. Louis: Quality Medical Publishing, 2005.

McAfee PC. "Comments on the van Ooij article." J Spinal Disord Tech 2005;18(1): 116-7.

Moore KR, Pinto MR, Butler M. Degenerative disc disease treated with combined anterior and posterior arthrodesis and posterior instrumentation. Spine 2002;27(15):1680-86.

Ondra SL, Marzouk S. Revision strategies for lumbar pseudarthrosis. Neurosurg Focus. 2003 Sep 15;15(3):E9.

Onestri ST. Failed Back Syndrome. The Neurologist 2004;10(5):259-264.

Pradhan BB, Nassar JA, Delamarter RB, Wang JC. Single-level lumbar spine fusion: a comparison of anterior and posterior approaches. J Spinal Disord Tech. 2002 Oct;15(5):355-61.

Putzier M, Funk JF, Schneider, SV. Charité Total Disk replacement – Clinical and radiographic results after an average follow up of 17 years. Eur Spine J 6: 586-591, 2005.

Regan JJ. Clinical Results of Charité Lumbar Total Disc Replacement. Orthop Clin N Am 2005;36:323-340.

Register F. Panel Transcript: Orthopedic and Rehabilitation Devices Panel of the Medical Devices Advisory Committee. (2004) [Transcript, FDA Orthopedic and Rehabilitation Devices Panel Meeting \(June 2, 2004\), available at http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/04/transcript/s/2004-4049t1.htm.](http://www.fda.gov/ohrms/dockets/ac/04/transcript/s/2004-4049t1.htm)

SariAli E, Lemaire JP, Pascal- Mousselard H, et al. In vivo study of the kinematics in axial rotation of the lumbar spine after total intervertebral disc replacement: long-term results: a 10-14 year follow up evaluation. Eur Spine J 2005;21:1-10.

Slosar PJ, Reynolds JB, Schofferman J, et al. Patient satisfaction after circumferential lumbar fusion. Spine 2000 Mar 15;25(6):722-6.

Technology Evaluation Center. (2005, April). Artificial vertebral disc replacement. (Vol. 20, No.1).

Tropiano P, Huang RC, Girardi FP, et al. Lumbar total disc replacement. J Bone & Joint Surg 82006;8:50-64.

van Ooij A, Oner FC, Verbout AJ. Complications of artificial disc replacement: a report of 27 patients with the SB Charite disc. J Spinal Disord Tech 2003;16:369-83.

Walsh TL, Hanscom B, Lurie JD, Weinstein JN. Is a condition-specific instrument for patients with low back pain/leg symptoms necessary? The responsiveness of the Oswestry Disability Index, MODEMS, and the SF-36. *Spine* 2003 Mar 15;28(6):607-15.

Zeegers WS, Bohnen LM, Laaper M, et al. Artificial disc replacement with the modular type SB Charité III: 2-year results in 50 prospectively studied patients. *Eur Spine J* 1999;8:210-217.